

~~George D. Brown Esq. Es.~~
~~with the author's hat removed~~



CAN
PAM

F

Fuller, Thomas

THE SCRIPTURAL WAY

B.



OF SUPPORTING

THE SERVICES OF RELIGION.

A CHARGE,

DELIVERED BY THE

VENERABLE T. B. FULLER, D.D., D.C.L.,

ARCHDEACON OF NIAGARA,

AT VISITATIONS OF

THE CLERGY AND CHURCHWARDENS;

Assembled at Newmarket on the 13th, and at St. Catharines on the
30th September; at Peterboro' on the 5th, Cobourg the 6th,
and Whitby the 7th of November, 1869.

TORONTO:



BELL, BARKER & Co., PRINTERS, 94 & 96 YONGE STREET.



T

THE SCRIPTURAL WAY

OF SUPPORTING

SERVICES OF RELIGION.

A CHARGE,

DELIVERED BY THE

VENERABLE T. B. FULLER, D.D., D.C.L.,

ARCHDEACON OF NIAGARA,

AT VISITATIONS OF

THE CLERGY AND CHURCHWARDENS;

Assembled at Newmarket on the 13th, and at St. Catharines on the
30th September; at Peterboro' on the 5th, Cobourg the 6th,
and Whitby the 7th of November, 1869.

TORONTO:

BELL, BARKER & Co., PRINTERS, 94 & 96 YONGE STREET.

Having been enabled, by the kind favor of a gracious God, since my appointment to the archdeaconry of Niagara, in February, 1867, to visit almost every parish and mission committed to my care by our late venerable Bishop, I now meet you, brethren of the clergy and laity, for the purpose of offering to you, assembled at this archdiaconal visitation, some suggestions in reference to those matters, which appertain more particularly to the temporalities of the Church, with which I am more especially charged, as archdeacon, and which are of paramount importance to the growth, nay to the very maintenance, of the Church in this diocese.

In visiting your several parishes and missions, I have learned with a great deal of pleasure that, with few exceptions, they are out of debt for the erection of their Churches and parsonages; and that, where there remains any debt, means have been taken for its liquidation. Great improvements in Church architecture are manifest in the Churches more recently erected; and special attention seems to have been taken, to secure, as far as possible, the union in the services of the Church of all the members of our Holy Communion present—an object of the first importance, not only to the growth in grace of our own people, but also to the effect that our services should have on those without our fold.

I regret much, that there are not more parsonages than there are amongst us, occupied by our brethren of the clergy, there being only twenty-three in the whole archdeaconry, comprising the counties of Lincoln, Welland, Haldimand, East and North York, Ontario, Victoria, Durham, Peterboro' and Northumberland; and some of these are only apologies for parsonages. As soon as a congregation, who have a resident minister, are out of debt for the erection of their Church, they should take steps to commence a parsonage at as early a day as possible. Being accustomed to exert themselves in the erection of their Church, they will not find the building of their parsonage so difficult, as if they are allowed to fall back into the old and evil habit of doing little or nothing for the Church of Christ. Besides there is nothing that unites a congregation more than having before it some common object, on which their thoughts are centred, and for which they are called to act. Whilst the work is going on they are all as one family. Too often when the work is done, and this bond of union is taken off, the unity produced by it fails. Moreover, there is nothing better calculated to secure to a parish a good clergyman than the possession of a comfortable parsonage. It is always worth far more to such a parish than the money it cost it. When a parish has secured a

Church and parsonage, it is the duty of that parish to secure, at least, a partial endowment. Opportunities are frequently occurring, where properties can be purchased for a trifle, which in the course of years will be of great value. A congregation who have built and paid for their Church and parsonage, can, under ordinary circumstances, easily secure for their parish a suitable endowment. It is not in the *ability* to do these things that our people are deficient; but in the practical belief, that it is their *duty* to devote a considerable portion of their means to such purposes. And, while teaching them their duty in this respect, it is well for our clergy to keep before their people some good work, in which they can engage and on which they can put in practice the lessons they are taught.

When people are accustomed to exertion they do not dislike it. It is only those unaccustomed to it, who feel it a burden. It is therefore not good for a congregation, any more than it is good for an individual, to have nothing to do. But surely no congregation in our archdeaconry need complain of having nothing to do for the Church of which they are members. There is work for all, if not in their own favored localities, in other parts of the archdeaconry. With one exception, that of York, there is no county within our bounds, in which there is a resident clergyman in every township. And I am sorry to be obliged to say, that there are several, which are almost entirely destitute of the ministrations of our Church. Even in the old and well settled counties of Lincoln and Welland there are three in the former, and four in the latter, without a resident clergyman. In the county of Haldimand we have three clergymen to ten townships. In the county of Ontario we have six clergymen to eleven townships; but of these six clergymen the services of four being exclusively confined to the three townships on the front, the eight townships in the rear, containing, according to the last census, six thousand Church people, have only two clergymen to labor in them. There were, according to the same authority, four thousand members of the Church in the then eighteen townships of the County of Victoria; and no doubt there are many more in that county, at the present time, as many persons have settled therein since the census was taken. To minister to these thousands, scattered over this immense territory, we have three clergymen; but as the services of two of them are confined almost exclusively to the two townships on the front of the county; those members of the Church, settled in the remaining sixteen townships, are left to the ministrations of the third, who, though an active and laborious missionary, *cannot attend to the spiritual wants of one tenth part of our people in his county.* Nor is the destitution a whit less appalling in the rear part of the county of Peterboro', where *there are two clergymen for twenty-one townships.* Surely, then, there is ample room, in which our people may exercise the most large-hearted beneficence.

But I suspect that they need not go beyond the limits of their own parishes or missions to find those *who have claims on them for far more than they do for them*. In what one of our parishes or missions, have our clergy the salaries that they ought to have? I know of none in this archdeaconry : and I know what the salaries of most of our clergy are. Forty years ago the salaries of the missionaries of this diocese were £200 sterling per annum. That salary was not accounted by the Society in England, who paid it, too high for our clergy. Nor was it. It only enabled them to live respectably and without corroding care for the families that God had given them. The salaries of the clergy in British Guiana at the present time are £500 sterling per annum. But, taking the lower standard of £200 sterling per annum as that suited for our clergy forty years ago, our clergy at the present day ought to have £400 sterling or \$2,000 per annum. For, during those forty years, in consequence of the increase of gold in California and Australia, *the cost of living has doubled*. But have the salaries of the missionaries doubled also? By no means; whilst the incomes of every one else in the community, the lawyers, the medical men, the merchants, the farmers, the mechanics, the laboring men, have kept pace with the increased cost of living; and whilst the salaries of the clerks in the Government offices, in the banks and insurance offices, have been greatly increased, *the salaries of the missionaries of this diocese have been reduced from £200 sterling or \$2,000 a year to \$600 ! !* The consequence has been, that there are few candidates for the ministry, and fewer still from the families of those clergymen, who are reduced to the greatest straits to eke out an existence. These sad and humiliating truths ought to be known and duly weighed by our people. We do not desire a wealthy clergy in this diocese; but we do desire a clergy, who can give themselves to the work of the Lord, "without distraction;" and it is the interest of the people, that they should have such a ministry. They have, moreover, *in abundance the means of affording to all the clergy of the diocese such salaries as they ought to enjoy*. And I believe, that if they were made thoroughly acquainted with the spiritual destitution of their brethren in many parts of the country, and *considered*, as they ought, the *condition* of the *clergy*, they would do far more for them, and for the waste places of the diocese, than they now do. But not only do our people need to be informed of the spiritual destitution, in which so many of their brethren are, and of the very straightened means, which our clergy have; but they require to be carefully and constantly taught what their true position in the sight of God is—*that they are not owners; but only stewards of the good things entrusted to them*.

Many people express their surprise at the smallness of the contributions of our people to God's service. They are small; pitifully small, compared with the means, which God has entrusted to their care. But

this can be accounted for, without accusing them of selfishness, or penuriousness. They are liberal in other things. They are quite as ready to help the poor as others are. They contributed very handsomely to "the Patriotic fund" for the relief of the widows and orphans of those who fell in the Crimean war, and the Lancashire operatives, a few years ago, benefited largely by their liberality. But, in regard to the claims which the Church of God has on their means, too many are in gross ignorance. They have not been taught from their childhood up (as they ought to have been taught) that God has, in all ages of the world, required his people to offer to his service a considerable portion of the means which He has graciously entrusted to their care.

From the first settlement of Ontario to the year 1834 "the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts" was ready to support missionaries to labor amongst our people without looking to them to contribute in any shape to their maintenance. All that those settlers, who desired the ministrations of our Church, had to do, was to memorialize the Bishop of the Diocese for a clergyman, and he sent their memorial to the venerable society mentioned above; and a clergyman was appointed to minister to them, at a salary of £200 sterling a year, *paid by the Society*. And when those same people required a Church, another excellent Society, that "for Promoting Christian Knowledge," was ready to aid them largely in the erection of their Church. But in the year 1834 the Society was obliged to notify the Bishop of the Diocese, that it would be impossible for it to continue the support of the missionaries in this country, and that the Society would be compelled to throw their maintenance on the people to whom they ministered. When this occurred the authorities of the Diocese were enabled to draw the salaries of our clergy from the Clergy Reserves fund, which, by that time, yielded a considerable sum each year, and of which a large amount had accumulated. They were enabled, also, to increase the number of the clergy and to maintain them from this fund, till the secularization of the Reserves in 1854. Had these Reserves not been secularised they would have afforded us, at the present time, ample means to support all our clergy as they ought to be supported. But, as you are well aware, the greater part of the fund, arising from the sale of those Reserves, has been lost to us; and only that part saved, for which our clergy, who were on the list in May, 1853, were enabled to commute their salaries. I mention this—not for the purpose of complaining of the act of our Legislature in 1854; (for I believe that it is the part of a good subject to bow with submission to the legislation of his country, even when he feels that an act of injustice has been done him, and I do not think that that act has been entirely without benefit to the Church;) but I mention it for the purpose of *showing* you, why we were not formerly compelled to call upon our people to do so much for the Church, as we have been compelled to do since the secularization of those Reserves;

and why our people, who were brought up in this country, where they could depend upon the society in England and the Clergy Reserves to meet our wants, have not been taught, as fully as they ought to have been, and as, under other circumstances, they probably would have been taught, their duty *to contribute of their worldly goods to the support and extension of the Church in this country.* Then with regard to those of our people, who have been brought up in England and Ireland, it should be remembered, that the law of the land in the shape of tithes and Church rates in England, the tithe of the land paid indirectly through the landlords in Ireland, shut out from their sight the undeniable fact, *that God has, in all ages of the world, required his people, directly or indirectly, to contribute to the maintenance of his ministry and the extension of his Church.* Being ignorant of this fact, and there being in this country no law of the land requiring them to contribute of their means to God's service, they have not seen, and, therefore, have not recognized their duty in this respect. Fifteen years ago the calls upon our people were but few ; and those very light, compared with what we have to make now. But these calls have to be made, and must be responded to. If the Church of Christ in our Diocese is to present the privileges of the Gospel to all our people, then those who are in the enjoyment of those privileges, must provide messengers to carry them to others, now destitute of them, and must furnish money to support them, at least in part, till those to whom they are sent are able to support the ministration of religion for themselves. And as her children go out from her more established and wealthier congregations to seek new homes in the wilderness, she ought to send with them shepherds who can keep them in the fold and gather in "others, not of this fold," that there may be one fold and one shepherd.

To be enabled to do this, as it ought to be done, needs sure and steady supplies ; flowing freely and bountifully, wherever a channel is opened, and blessing him who gives, and him who receives. Such supplies can only come from those, who have a clear and intelligent apprehension of duty, quickened and enlivened by a strong sense of love to God and man, and prompting them to bestow of their goods for the work of the Lord in our land, according as he has commanded in his most holy word. But, before attempting to lay fully before you, what I consider to be the duty of christians in this matter, and to sustain my views by such arguments as I can adduce in favor of them, I wish to call your attention to the *important bearing* of this money *question* on the *spiritual interests* of all christians. It is too apt to be regarded merely as a business matter, or, at most, as a matter of feeling, where a decision is to be left to one's own choice. It is too apt to be forgotten, that the disposal, that we make of our worldly substance affects even more directly our *spiritual* than our *temporal* welfare. If there be a duty, which we owe Almighty God in this matter, then not to *discharge* that duty, is

to
los
lies
the
in
act
hin
his
T
sub
enjo
dow
ind
sely
inte
thei
igno
this
und
as to
pert
it, e
man
fune
hold
entru
our p
ourse
give
only
cause
mere
at wi
"in
to H
and a
ward
may
an ol
rent
This
guilt
made
do in
This

to commit sin : and every sin committed and not repented of, brings loss and sorrow to the soul. If men spend on themselves, their families, and their own lusts and pleasures, what they ought to spend for the good of their fellow men and the glory of God, they are very *guilty* in this matter. For just as soon as one takes away any act or class of actions from the control or direction of God's will, by doing so he puts himself in a state of opposition to God, incurs his displeasure, grieves his Holy Spirit and exposes himself to spiritual death.

There is great sensitiveness among men, especially rich men, on this subject. They are quite willing to listen to generalities, and they even enjoy the eloquence of earnest appeals to feeling ; but when you come down to details and attempt to give them rules applicable to their own individual cases, though you leave the application thereof to themselves, they are quite disposed to look upon such, as an unwarrantable interference with the liberty, which, they claim, they have, to do with their worldly means as they will. This arises in a great measure from ignorance of what their *true position* is, as entrusted with the things of this world. The laws of God, in regard to property, have been so little understood, because so little taught, that many men have gone so far as to say, that *a man has a perfect right to do what he will with his property*, and that he *need not*, and *should not*, recognize God's claim upon it, even in the slightest degree. And this is the idea entertained by many of the most honest men in the community : by men who are punctiliously particular about giving every one his due. And this I hold to be *the sin of the Church* in reference to the use of the means entrusted to her people. It has been well said, "that when we claim our possessions as our own, and that we have the right to determine for ourselves what use we shall make of them—to what purpose we will give them, and to whom we will entrust them, we sin against God ; not only, because we refused to submit our actions to his control ; but because we rob Him of that, which belongs to Him, and which he has merely entrusted to our care. We are not the owners ; but the tenants at will of the property we possess. We are not independent possessors "in fee simple" of it : but are holders of it, for his glory, and to make to Him constant returns, as an acknowledgment of His superior title, and as the certain means of insuring a present blessing and a higher reward." "No matter how small or how large the amount we have, may be, He, who gives us power to acquire property, adds to this power an obligation to render back to Him a portion thereof, as a reserved rent ; and, if we keep this back from Him, we rob him of his due." This view of the matter deserves the most careful consideration. *The guilt of robbing God in tithes and offerings* was one of the heaviest charges made by the Almighty against His ancient people ; and had much to do in bringing upon them the calamities, with which they were visited. This must be evident to every careful reader of the Old Testament.

And, if the Church in this Diocese is doing the very same thing, our sin is very great, and we should not wonder, that the dew of heavenly grace are withheld, and that our spiritual life is feeble. But, if we will, in obedience to God's command, bring all our tithes into God's storehouse, we have His gracious promise that, other things being right with us, He will "open the windows of heaven and pour out a blessing till there shall be no room to receive it."

But not only do ignorance of duty, and that unwillingness so characteristic of the present day to confess God's claim upon our possessions, cause the sin of the Church in this matter to be very great ; but, alas ! there are several other influences, subtle and powerful, working out the same result. The acquisition of wealth by our people opens the way for the admission of two of the most subtle and dangerous influences that can affect the christian's life. Worldliness and covetousness come in like a flood the moment a person reaches a point in social life, which the possession of large means gives him. Insatiable as death, and with an appetite that grows by what it feeds on, they surely draw him, who begins to yield to their demands, further and further away from God and holiness, and consume the best fruits of the Spirit. This is the reason, why so many men and women professing godliness, who spend thousands on themselves and families, can *never afford to do any thing for God and his Church*. All is spent upon themselves, their pomps and vanities ; and nothing is left for religion.

Let us then ascertain if we can, what God expects from his people at the present time. It is indeed often claimed, that it is impossible to ascertain this : because it is alleged, that we cannot point out any specific command in the New Testament definitely determining the proportion of our income that we should give to God's service. But are specific commands always required in these matters by those, who make this objection ? Where then, I would ask, do these good people find any *specific command* in the New Testament, to observe the first day of the week, as the christian sabbath ; or to baptize infants ; or to administer the Lord's supper to our mothers and sisters in Israel ; or to have the three orders of Bishop, Priest and Deacon in the christian Church ? Even then, if the New Testament gives us no positive command on this subject ; yet if we can show what was God's mind in regard to it, under the former dispensation, and what was the light, in which He viewed man's possession of the good things entrusted to him ; if we can show what was the practice of the primitive Church in this matter ; then, as obedient children, we should cheerfully acknowledge this rule and allow it to bind our consciences and direct our actions. Every intelligent christian knows, that God's ancient people, the Jews, were bound by God's own command to give "tithes of all they possessed," for the support of the ministering tribe of Levi—that tribe, which God was pleased to set apart for his own service, and *who were to have no inheri-*

t
a
P
n
o
te
p
ia
fr
me
ma
ha
ear
God
by
oria
gav
the
that
Chri
ed in
pers
is ge
sacri
(in re
sabb
exist
and,
him v
that,
cease
cogni
they v
tional
curing
The
the sec
herd o
A seco
and a
were in
vout I
third o
Whate
ancient

tance with their brethren, the Lord being their inheritance. But we are not to suppose, that the law of tithes was confined to God's chosen people, the Israelites. It neither had its origin at the time of Moses ; nor, as a rule, was it confined to the Israelites. But it rather had its origin in the very beginning, and was found amongst many widely scattered nations. We are told, on the best of authority, that it was the practice of heathen nations—of Greeks, Romans, Carthaginians, Arabians and others—to apply the tenths derived from property in general, from the spoils of their enemies, from confiscated goods, or from commercial profits, to sacred purposes. In the Bible we have two very remarkable instances of the observance of this ancient law ; one by Abraham, when returning victorious from the pursuit of the kings who had carried off his nephew Lot, he met Melchisedec, Priest of the Most High God, and gave him tithes ; a religious act, which is specially noticed by the Apostle in the epistle to the Hebrews. Jacob too set up a memorial of God's mercy shown him in Bethel, saying, "Of all that thou gavest me, I will surely give the tenth unto them." And the Apostle, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in referring to the case of Abraham, says that he paid the tithes to Melchisedec, as the type and forerunner of Christ, who abides as our priest forever, to whom, now that he is exalted into the heavens, it is proper that his people should pay *tithes* in the persons of his ministers. The Mosaic tithe system was not, then, (as is generally supposed) a new and independent law ; but, like the law of sacrifices and the observance of the seventh day as the Lord's sabbath (in reference to which he said in the fourth commandment, *Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy*)—had its basis in practices and regulations existing and binding upon God's people *long before the time of Moses*, and, therefore, likely to continue in force long after the law given by him was done away. The most that can be claimed in regard to it is, that, so far as it was specially adapted to the Jewish people, it should cease with the doing away of their polity. In addition to the tenth recognized as due by Abraham, and promised to God by their father Jacob, they were required, by God's express command to Moses, to give additional tenths, as tokens of their obedient spirit, and as a means of securing God's special favor and blessing.

The Mosaic tithe required, first, "all the tithe of the land, whether of the seed of the land, or of the fruits of the tree, and all the tithe of the herd or flock." *This belonged to the tribe of Levi*, as above mentioned. A second tithe was to be given for the use of the tabernacle and temple ; and a third tithe was to be given for the support of the poor. These were in *addition* to first-fruits and various offerings, so that every devout Israelite was required, by God's own command, to give about a *third* of his income to God's ministers, God's service, and God's poor. Whatever there was of peculiar rigour in the demands made upon the ancient Israelite, was found in the requisition of the *additional tithes* ;

and admitting, (as we must do) that the peculiar hardships of the old covenant are done away in Christ, still we have no right to do away all law on this, more than on any other, subject ; and we are simply left to fall back on that law, which the patriarchs observed, and which even heathen nations did not deem too exacting. The liberty with which Christ makes us free, does not release us from all law ; but only from the law of "Commandments contained in the ordinances" of the old ceremonial law. It leaves us not without the "law of God ; but under the law to Christ ;" and still obedience to the revealed will of God, in regard to our property, is a proof of our love to him, and a means of attaining to higher measures of grace, and to a more deep and fervent love. We cannot then help thinking, that the obedient spirit of a sincere and earnest christian will recognize, in what has been adduced to-day, from the practice of God's people in the patriarchal ages and under the Mosaic dispensation, a strong ground for maintaining that the original law, requiring one tenth of every man's income for the service of God, is still binding upon men, and should be so regarded by all who desire to be earnest and obedient servants of the Most High God. And in this view of the case we are fully sustained by some very able essays written in our day on "the duty of giving to God's service according to means and income." Several years ago every clergyman of this diocese was furnished by some kind christian friends in Montreal with a copy of a remarkable book called "Gold and the Gospel." This comprises five essays written for two prizes, one of £50 for the best, and another of £20 for the second best, essay on the scriptural duty of giving according to means and income. These five essays were found to be so equal that each of the five judges preferred a different essay ; and the prizes were divided amongst the writers of them. The authors of these essays were two Englishmen, two Irishmen, and one Scotchman. One is a minister of the Established Church of Ireland, the second is a minister of the synod of Ulster, the third is a Free Kirk minister of Scotland, the fourth is an Independent minister of England, and the fifth a layman. About the same time a clergyman of this Diocese, a man of ability and zeal, published a valuable essay on the same important subject entitled "The sacerdotal tithe." Nearly contemporaneous with these were three premium essays by three Congregational ministers of New England, and also three, by three Methodist ministers of the United States, on the same subject. And they one and all came to the same conclusion, that it is the duty of every christian religiously to set apart a portion of his income for God's service as God has blessed him ; and several of these writers fixed upon a tithe as the proportion to be set apart.

And surely all the reasons that ever existed for such an arrangement continue in full force now, and at all times. Is this offering of a tenth of our income to God's service, to be considered as an acknowledgment of our dependence upon God, and of His right to all that we possess ? This

was the ground on which this offering was placed of old,—“The earth is the Lord’s and the fulness thereof.” “The silver and the gold are his.” And the condition on which we hold our possessions is just the same as that, on which men held theirs from the beginning. The Lord has not ceased to be the proprietor of the world, though he has been pleased to send his Son down upon the earth. Men have not ceased to be tenants, at his will, of the things they possess for the time being. They have not ceased to be mere stewards of the talents committed to them. And Christians will be required to account just as fully for the use of those talents, as will be the Jews of old for the talents they possessed in their days. Besides, brethren, shall we, who have received the atonement, which the ancient patriarchs and prophets and men of faith had not received, but only saw afar off—shall we conceive it to be our duty to do *less* for the glory of God—to acknowledge *less clearly* and *less distinctly*, and *less fully* His rule over us, and to manifest it by less cheerful obedience to his will, gathered from his most holy word? Surely, brethren, every reason, why they of old should honor God with their substance and with the first fruits of all their increase, presses upon the Christian with vastly increased obligation. If any are bound to do so, it is surely they, for whose sake He, being rich, became poor, that they, through his poverty, might be rich. God might have provided for his service upon earth otherwise, had he seen fit to do so. He might have sent down his angels, as ministering servants upon earth, to carry far and wide the blessings of the Gospel. But he has been pleased to put this honour on men. It has pleased Him to be served in His Church by men, *chosen and set apart for this special work; just as the tribe of Levi were set apart for his special service under the Mosaic dispensation.* These men are called upon to give up, or to abstain from the usual avocations of life. They cannot be lawyers or medical men; they cannot support themselves and their families by merchandise or by farming. No; they are called to devote themselves, their time, their talents, their energies to the service of God amongst his people. Like the tribe of Levi, who had no inheritance amongst their brethren, they are excluded by the very nature of their office from providing for the sustenance of themselves and families in the same way, that the rest of the community provide for themselves and others. *And as the Levites had a right to a maintenance from the income of their brethren, so have the ministers of Christ in the present day.* As servants of God, waiting continually on God’s people and serving them to the utmost of their power, they have a right to a share of the worldly goods of those who are left free to gain and to possess. What reason is there to suppose that God will now be satisfied with a less share, devoted to this particular object, than when, as in the patriarchal ages, there was generally no priestly order and every man was a priest in his own house? What right have we to conclude, that they, who preach the

Gospel should not enjoy as *large* a measure of benefit from those, to whom they preach, and for whom they minister, as was enjoyed by those who served the tabernacle?

And thus we come to the consideration of those striking words of St. Paul, contained in the 9th chapter of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, where he reasons, both from the fitness of things, and from the principles laid down in the old law, that they who minister in spiritual things have a right to partake of the carnal things of those to whom they minister. And then he closes the argument by this inquiry: "*Do ye not know, that they who minister about holy things live of the things of the temple; and they which wait at the altar are partakers of the altar? Even so hath the Lord ordained that they who preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel.*" Here then, a perfect parallel is established between the provision made for the Levites under the Old Testament and for the ministers of Christ under the new. It is not something left to be decided by individual tastes or notions or preferences. *Christ has ordained, has established, this as a permanent arrangement* in his kingdom—that his servants under the Gospel should be supported *in the same way, and by the same rule, as were the Jewish priesthood.* If the words "even so hath the Lord ordained" prescribe no rule, but leave every man at perfect liberty to do as he pleases—then he who pleases to give nothing for the service of God, under the Christian dispensation, violates no obligation. But I would ask, if every man is at liberty to give much or little or nothing, according to his own fancy, what becomes of the apostle's reasoning? How could he say—that, *as the Levite was to live by a tenth of the incomes of the other people of Israel, the Christian minister was to do the same—if it be not the duty of the people to contribute a tenth of their income to his support?* There is no argument, no force in the words of the inspired apostle, *unless the Lord has ordained that as the tithes were paid to the priest of the temple, they should likewise be paid to those who minister in holy things under the Gospel.* But if this be admitted, then the apostle's argument is strong and cogent; and the comparison between the way of maintaining God's ministers under the two dispensations is full and complete.

This is a point of so much importance to so many thousands in this Archdeaconry, that I trust you will bear with me, brethren, if I still dwell on it a little longer. As I stated before, there is contained in these words of St. Paul a more clear and precise *authority* for continuing the payment of tithes to the Lord under the Gospel, than is anywhere found for four of the most important and most widely acknowledged ordinances and practices in the Christian Church. "Where, for instance," (as has been well asked), "is there any equally precise direction for the change from the Jewish Sabbath, on the last day of the week, to the Christian Sabbath, on the first day of the week, as the

great day of religious observances. We have, it is true, the record in a few places in the Acts of the Apostles, of the early Christian Church assembling on the first day of the week. We have the fuller and more circumstantial testimony to the same effect of the early fathers and historians of the Church ; but no word of any one of the apostles is to be found, in the New Testament, declaring that, as the last day of the week had been kept as the Sabbath under the law, even so was the first day of the week to be kept as the Christian Sabbath, under the Gospel dispensation. And yet, brethren, the deepest convictions of the whole Church have always sustained and justified the authoritative appointment of the day, on which Jesus Christ arose triumphant from the grave, as the great day for Christian worship and religious observances.

Again, what volumes of controversy, in regard to the orders of the ministry, would have been avoided, if anywhere in the New Testament, could have been found words equivalent, in their application, to that subject, to those to which we now refer—if it had only once been said, that, as the ministry under the law was threefold, consisting of High-Priests, Priests, and Levites, "*even so, hath the Lord also ordained,*" that, under the Gospel, there should likewise be Bishops, Priests and Deacons. Or, again, how effectually would the whole controversy on the subject of infant baptism have been settled, if we could have put our finger on any page in the New Testament, which declared, that, as infants were brought into covenant with God, under the Old Testament, at the early age of eight days, by the rite of circumcision, *even so* they should be brought into covenant with God at an early age, under the Gospel, by the rite of baptism. And nowhere do we find any *authority* whatever for admitting females to the Lord's supper ; but the manifest propriety of the thing and the practice of the early Christians has very properly secured for our mothers and sisters and daughters this blessed privilege. But there is nothing in the New Testament in favor of any of those usages and practices, at all to be compared with St. Paul's declaration "*even so hath the Lord ordained, that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel.*" And yet, brethren, we regard these ordinances and practices as binding upon us ! How much more then should we feel it our *duty* to observe that rule, which St. Paul so distinctly declares God himself has ordained ?" And if, brethren, we consider the practice of the early Christian Church (as has been well observed by a writer on this subject to whom we are indebted for much of this argument) we shall see how entirely it sustains our view of the duty of offering for God's cause, at the very least, the tenth of our income. When our blessed Lord sent out his apostles and seventy disciples to preach the Gospel, they acknowledged, on their return, that they lacked nothing. And after the day of Pentecost, when from the great number to be supported, and the few to con-

tribute to their support, the offerings must have been very abundant, still there was no want. "Those that had possessions and goods sold them, and distribution was made to all men, as every one had need." Nor did those, who lived in subsequent times, fail in giving more to God's service than was required by the rule, by which both Jews and Gentiles had been bound under the Patriarchal and Mosaic dispensations. Thus we find Justin Martyn, who lived A.D. 160, testifying to this effect—"And now we bring all that we have into common, and communicate it to every one that wants." Irenæus, who lived A.D. 180, tells us that, "the Jews consecrated a tenth; but the Christians give all they have unto God, and would not give less than the Jews; because they have a better hope." And accordingly the learned Selden, in his "History of Tithes," writes as follows: "So liberal was the devotion of believers, that their bounty to the Evangelical Priesthood far exceeded what the tenth would have been. The liberality formerly used had been so great, that in respect thereof tenths would have been a small part. It had been to little purpose, indeed, to have had tithes of annual increase paid, when that most bountiful devotion of Christians continued in frequent offerings, both of lands and goods, to such large value."

As has been well remarked, "These testimonies, while accounting for the absence in the early Church of any recorded rule or precept respecting the proportion of goods we owe God, still show most clearly what were the convictions of duty among Christians in those purer ages of faith and piety. They deemed it unworthy of them to do less than Jews or heathens had done before them. They considered themselves bound rather to exceed than to fall short of the old standard. They regarded the tenth offered to God, not as the outside figure, but as the very lowest sum, that they could offer." The language of St. Augustine on this subject is very striking: "Separate something and designate some fixed portion, either from your yearly fruits or daily income. Will you give the tenth? The tenth, then, let it be, although this is a small portion. For it is said the Pharisees give tithes. But what saith the Lord—"Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall not enter the Kingdom of Heaven. Now, he, whose righteousness thou art bound to exceed, gives tithes: but thou givest not a thousandth part. How will you exceed him, whom you do not even equal?" The universal liberality of the early Christians in maintaining the Christian ministry and providing all that was needed to support and extend the Church was such, that it would have seemed almost to degrade the matter to establish a rule that would have limited the gifts of Christians to so small a portion as a tenth.

It is objected to this rule of giving a tenth of our income to God's service, that it interferes with Christian liberty, by imposing a law in regard to our offerings, where a man is left free to judge, under the guidance of God's spirit, what he ought to give of his substance for

God's service. Apply the *principle* of this objection to other matters ; and it proves too much. It makes a man a guide to himself in every thing. With the Quakers it does away with the Christian sacraments : with "the Plymouth Brethren" it breaks down the Christian ministry and the order of the Church. It allows every man, who fancies himself guided by the Spirit, to go to any excess of license he pleases ; as many have done in all ages in the name of religion—witness the Mormons of our day.

But a man truly under the guidance of God's Spirit, is so far from depending on his own impulses that he takes the utmost pains to learn God's will in regard to the point in question whatever it may be ; and having ascertained what that will is, he readily and gladly obeys it. This is Christian liberty—the liberty of love, "the service of God, which is perfect freedom—to subject all our actions, with a cheerful mind, to God's will."

And a law to regulate our use of money is no more *inconsistent* with Christian liberty, than any of the laws of the Decalogue, all of which Churchmen believe to be binding on them.

A second objection to this rule is, that it is oppressive and that the generality of Christians cannot afford it. This objection, at the outset, can apply only to those, whose very limited means afford them only barely enough to procure for themselves and families necessary food, raiment and shelter. But it so happens that some of those, who observe this rule most religiously, belong to this very class ; and deem it a high privilege to deny themselves, that they may, of their slender means, enjoy the pleasure of contributing to the extension of God's Kingdom on earth.

The principle that prompts to such giving, keeps down vain and idle expenses, saves the money spent in the bar-room and in other injurious ways, and prompts to industry, frugality and economy. Of two men with equal incomes and equal families depending on them, he who gives systematically to God's cause, is always the happier, generally the richer man, than he who gives nothing. But, after all, the great question is not, how we can afford it ; but does God require it ? If he has, in his infinite wisdom, made it a test and trial of our faith and love, it is ours to endure the trial, and stand the test, by giving to him, as he has commanded us in his blessed word, and waiting to see whether or not he will open the windows of heaven, and pour down upon us of his goodness. As has been well remarked—"The difficulty will be dissolved and vanish by experience. Obedience requires faith ; but brings its own reward with it."

A third objection is, that the tenth of the incomes of all our people would be an exorbitant provision. But it was not so found amongst the Jews. And when we consider the various objects to which these tenths are to be applied, it will be manifest that they will not be at all

too much. The building of churches worthy of God's service: the maintenance of the Christian ministry as they ought to be maintained; not on the *pitiful salary of \$600 a year*; but on that of \$2,000 a year: the support of clergymen for every four or five hundred souls; not as is the average in this diocese, one for every fifteen hundred, and those too scattered over five or six townships, but within reasonable limits: the support of the widows and orphans of deceased clergymen: the maintenance, in comfort of those clergymen, who are no longer fit for active work: the support of young men of piety and ability, but of small means, for the Christian ministry: the circulation of Bibles, Prayer Books and other religious books and tracts, amongst our people: the maintenance of good schools for the young of our communion, where they could be trained in the principles of our most holy faith: in short, whatever is connected with the promotion of religion amongst our people, being amongst the things to be provided for from the contributions of the faithful, it would be found that one tenth of their incomes would not be at all too much. Besides, brethren, we may ask with emphasis, *would divine wisdom have sanctioned, nay commanded, an exorbitant provision.*

The want of this principle amongst our people has forced our clergy to submit to, if not to sanction and encourage, ways of raising money for Church purposes which their consciences have condemned. It is quite time, therefore, that the true Scriptural rule of offering were generally inculcated. It will not be learnt unless it be taught. And who are to teach this great lesson, all over our country, if our clergy do not do it? I know that there is a sensitiveness among our clergy on this subject; but think it should not exist. If God has ordained that, as under the law, his ministers were supported by the offering of a fixed portion of every man's income; so they who preach the Gospel should be maintained by those to whom they minister; then it *becomes every minister of Christ to teach this*, amongst the other things that God has ordained; and he should not be deterred from doing so by any fear of giving offence, or of being accused of preaching for his own benefit. It is an ordinance of God: and, unless he instructs his people in regard to it, he does not "declare unto them the whole counsel of God."

At a time like this—when our people generally have had so little instruction in regard to their positions, as mere *tenants*, and *not owners*, of their possessions—when circumstances have shut out from the eyes of our people, whether brought up in this country, or in England or Ireland, the fact, that *God has in all ages required his people, directly or indirectly, to contribute a considerable portion of their income to the support of his ministry, and the extension of his Church*; and, when so many people fancy, that they are at perfect liberty, to give or to withhold their means, it becomes us to recall men to first principles, and to

show
forth
At
an a
in o
man
whic
nize
pleas
Niag
then
to m
ally
then
as a
this
and
have
God'
rousl
in a
for t
when
meet
ren,
tions
in th
versa
God'
Pray
in ad
servi
unde
whos
have
tions
utter
an a
an u
the l
plea
thos
busi
ling
that

show them (as I have endeavoured to do to-day) what God's word sets forth as due by God's people to His service.

And in concluding this long charge I wish to call your attention to an act of worship, which has come to be almost universally overlooked in our day. It is one, in regard to which the Old Testament lays down many rules, to which distinct reference is made in the New Testament, which is fully provided for in our Prayer Books, and which is recognized in the standards of other religious bodies. Some years ago I had the pleasure of travelling from the city of Toronto to the Suspension Bridge, Niagara Falls, with an eminent Presbyterian divine from Kentucky, then residing in that city. In the course of conversation he remarked to me, that he admired our Prayer Book very much; and referred specially to that part of it, which makes ample provision for setting before them in the "offertory sentences" *the duty of offering to God's service, as a part of public worship*. "Our Church," remarked he, "requires this from us, as she requires Prayer, Praise, the reading of God's word, and the preaching of the Gospel in public worship. But our people have utterly forgotten the former. They never think of offering to God's service as an act of public worship. They may respond generously to an appeal for some worthy object, if it be placed before them in a forcible manner. They freely throw their dollars on to the plate, for the collection; but with as little regard to God in what they do, as when they throw their money into the plate, when it is sent round to meet election or any other secular expenses." Now, I am afraid brethren, that these remarks would apply equally as well to many congregations amongst us. But this should not be so. The offertory sentences in the communion office are a strong witness for the ancient, the universal idea of public worship, that an essential part thereof is giving to God's service in God's house. It is another of those cases, where our Prayer Book puts to shame our practice—where our professions are far in advance of our actions; and which proves that the offertory in our service has utterly lost its force and significance. Our people do not understand its meaning. Our clergy neglect to explain it to those, in whose hearing they repeat the sentences, Sunday after Sunday. We have reason to believe, that many good pious people in our congregations complain of the offertory, as interfering with their devotions. So utterly ignorant are they of the origin and intention of this service, that an act of worship, as old as any on record in the Bible, seems to them an unmeaning interference with their devotions, and suggests to them the bank, the shop or the market. "They have come to worship, they plead, undisturbed by any reminiscences of their week day lives; but those plates, which are presented to them, carry them back to their business again, despite of themselves." Now, is not this fact a startling rebuke to the teaching of the age, which leaves a man to believe, that the duties of the Sunday and the duties of the week day are antag-

onistic, the one to the other—that, whilst he must serve God on the Sabbath day, he may reasonably enough serve the world the rest of the week—that it is no part of religion to require all his life—his shop life, and his market life, and his farm life, and his office life, as well as his Church life, to be a continual service to Almighty God.

Is it not amazing to find men calling themselves Christians, “confessing that they feel, that they *must* devote their week days to the service of Mammon, and that their money is connected only with the things of the world that now is. It was one design of the offertory to correct this error—to show men that a part of their worldly goods is to be used as an “*offering to God*” as a *portion of his public service*; that they should connect their money with religious duties, and their gains of it with religious associations; that their week days should not be a sordid slavery to the world; but a service due to Almighty God, the fruits of which could be offered acceptably, in his own temple. Men must learn, that giving to God’s service, through the offertory, is an essential part of public worship, quite as much so as praying and singing. They must recognize the plates to receive their offerings as essential parts of Church furniture; and the putting their money thereon as a devotional act. They should realize the fact, that the Prayer Book, calls these offerings “*the devotions of the people*”—that they are required to offer them, as a *religious service*—to give to their Saviour in his own house that money, which represents the moral value of their lives.

I feel persuaded, brethren, that if the great truths, which I have endeavoured to set forth in this charge, were from time to time inculcated in our pulpits, taught in our families and in our Sunday schools, and disseminated far and wide by the press, (that great engine for good as well as evil), a great change would come over our Diocese, our people would feel it not only their duty, but their privilege, to give a fixed portion of their incomes, whether smaller or larger, to God’s service; the work of God would be greatly accelerated therein; old debts for Church purposes would speedily be paid; the ministry would be sufficiently maintained; new churches, worthy of God’s service, would be built and paid for; our missionaries would be quadrupled and maintained in a manner becoming the ministers of Christ; and the waste places of the Diocese would blossom as the rose; whilst our people, giving from right principles, and denying themselves that they might give—would “grow daily in grace and in meetness for glory,” at the same time rejoicing, that they were counted worthy to contribute of their means to God’s cause on earth.

on the
of the
op life,
as his

"con-
to the
th the
fertory
oods is
; that
r gains
ot be a
d, the
Men
an es-
nging.
ential
as a
Book,
are re-
our in
their

ve en-
located
, and
ood as
people
fixed
ervice ;
ts for
suffi-
ld be
main-
waste
people,
night
at the
ute of